In the Drawings

There are no amendments to the drawings.

Remarks

Applicant has amended the specification to include the terms "processor" program and "device" program as identifiers to the two programs identified at page 6, second full paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was added by the amendment. For example, the specification at page 6, second full paragraph refers to "a configurable hardware device and a processor . . . for executing the program" and further goes on to say that "the program runs on the processor and configures the configurable hardware device." The specification then refers to a second program stating "[t]he system may further include a program executing on the CCU for overwriting a pre-existing program on the CCU." Accordingly, the specification supports a reading of two different programs, one that is used to configure the configurable hardware device (e.g. the device program) and one that is used to program the processor (e.g. the processor program).

Applicant has amended claim 35 to recite "said processor receiving said processor program for overwriting a pre-existing program on said processor." Applicant has further amended claim 47 to recite "overwriting a pre-existing program on the processor with the processor program." Applicant has still further amended claim 54 to recite "said processor receiving said processor program for overwriting a pre-existing program on said processor." Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments are supported by the specification on page 6, second full paragraph. In addition, Applicant has removed all reference to the processor program being stored on the storage device.

Claims 35-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner has submitted that "the specification does not disclose the use of a processor program and a device program and instead discloses a single program" and that "the specification continually refers to "program" in the singular and never discusses two different types of programs." (Official Action, 8/22/06, p. 3.) Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Originally filed Claim 27 identified the camera control unit including: a configurable device; and a processor; where a program executed on the processor for modifying the configurable device. The program referenced in Claim 27 is the "device program." However, with regard to the programming of the processor, it is noted that another separate program first executes on the processor before the programming of the configurable hardware device occurs. For example, the specification states that after "program 42 has been retrieved/received 84, control unit 20 executes 86 program 42" and that as a second step "after executing 86 program 42 [processor program]" the "method includes programming [device program] or configuring 88 control unit 20 . . . to process image data 32." (p. 10, lns. 4-10.) Therefore, the first step is to program the processor (which is accomplished by a first program); while the second step is to then program the configurable device (which is accomplished by a second program.)

It is further noted that the specification states that "the system further includes a configurable hardware device and a processor located on the CCU for executing the program." (p. 6, lns. 9-11.) The specification further states "the [device/second] program runs on the processor and configures the configurable hardware device" and that the "system may further include a [processor/first] program executing on the CCU for over-writing a pre-existing program on the CCU." (p. 6, lns. 11-14.) Accordingly, two separate programs are identified in the specification, a first for overwriting a pre-existing program on the CCU (literally overwriting a pre-existing processor program) and a second program running on the processor for programming the configurable device. Applicant has further amended the specification to include the identifiers *processor* program and *device* program to more clearly differentiate these two programs.

In addition, with regard to Claim 36, which states that "said at least one configurable hardware device is selected from the group consisting of: field programmable gate arrays, and computer programmable logic devices; and said processor is selected from the group consisting of digital signal processors, microprocessors and microcontrollers." We note that originally filed Claims 2 and 4 include these limitations and that originally filed Claim 27 discloses that the camera control unit includes both the configurable hardware device and a processor.

Therefore, the specification discusses multiple embodiments for the invention. In one such embodiment, the CCU includes both a configurable hardware device and a processor. (p. 6, lns. 9-11.) In this embodiment, a first program executes on the proc-

essor on the CCU to overwrite a pre-existing program, and a second program then runs

on the processor and configures the configurable hardware device on the CCU. (p. 6,

lns. 11-14.) Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification does dis-

close and teach two different types of programs.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 35-58 are in order for allowance and early

notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 20, 2006

Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Registration No. 33,558
Steven B. Simonis, Registration No. 54,449
Attorneys for Applicants
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, CT 06905-5619
203 324-6155